



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/688,465	10/16/2000	Bernhard Schatzler	GR 97 P 1049 D	1415

7590 04/18/2002

Laurence A Greenberg
P O Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022

EXAMINER

PAREKH, NITIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/688,465	Applicant(s) Schatzler
	Examiner Nitin Parekh	Art Unit 2811
		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 23, 2002

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle* 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the applica

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from considera

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirem

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
17) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). <u>3</u>	20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 2811

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim et al (US Pat. 5773878) in view of the admitted prior art (APA- Inaba, US Pat. 4258381).

Regarding claims 1 and 3, Lim et al disclose an electronic component comprising :

- a housing made of a casting/molding compound (24 in Fig. 2)
- an integrated circuit (IC) having base area (20 in Fig. 2)
- a lead frame (100 in Fig. 2) having an island/die pad with a continuous/unpatterned base area supporting the IC (14 in Fig. 2; Col. 1, line 33), the base area of the IC being smaller than that of the island, and

Art Unit: 2811

- the IC and the island being embedded in the housing so that a thickness of the housing region above the IC is substantially equal to that below the island (Fig. 2 and 4A; Col. 3, line 30) for avoiding deformation/flexure of the molding compound/casting (Fig. 1-4B; Col. 1, line 20- Col. 4, line 40).

Lim et al disclose the ratio between the length/vertical dimension of the IC and the island/die pad being 0.75 (as measured from the dimensions in Fig. 2) but fail to specify the ratio between the base area of the IC and that of the island/die pad being 0.7- 0.9 for avoiding the flexure of the housing. Lim et al further disclose the island/die pad being square in shape (Col. 1, line 35).

The APA teaches using the IC and the island having conventional square shapes (Col. 4) and using a range of island dimensions to support various chip sizes (Col. 2, line 55). Furthermore, it is a matter of design choice to select the parameters such as the dimensions of the IC chip including width, shape, etc. to achieve the desired base area supporting the IC, overall package size and electrical/thermal performance for the lead frame package.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to select ratio between the base area of the IC and that of the island/die pad of 0.7- 0.9 for avoiding the flexure/deformation and to improve the reliability using the APA's component design in Lim et al's housing.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claim 2, Lim et al disclose an adhesive bonding of the IC to the island (Col. 2, line 9) and a hollow groove shape/fillet being formed by emerged adhesive at the notch/groove/overhang portion of the island (Fig. 2)

Regarding claim 4, Lim et al disclose the lead frame including the leads being conventionally bonded/routed to the island (Col. 2, line 11).

Regarding claim 5, Lim et al disclose the lead frame including the leads being vertically centered within the housing and the island being vertically lowered with respect to the leads (Fig. 2).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 01-23-02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Applicant contends that none of the references teach using the ratio between the base area of the IC and that of the island/die pad being 0.7- 0.9 for avoiding the flexure of the housing.

As explained above, Lim et al show the approximate dimensional ratio of the IC and island only in one direction but fail to specify the ratio showing the top/plan view.

Art Unit: 2811

However, Inaba (APA) teaches using the IC and the island having conventional square shapes (Col. 4) and using a variety of size/dimensions of IC and island (Col. 2, line 57; Col. 5, line 17) where the range of both varies from 3 mm to 7.5 mm (area variation from about 9 to 56 sq. mm). Furthermore, Inaba teaches selecting the dimensions of the island depending on the size of the IC to achieve the desired bonding strength, heat dissipation and mechanical strength for the island (Col. 2, line 55; Col. 5, line 1-25).

Therefore, Inaba's teaching for selecting the range of chip/island dimensions/design parameters such as area ratio being from 0.7-0.9 is applied to Lim et al's housing to avoid the flexure.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2811

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Papers related to this application may be submitted directly to Art Unit 2811 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Art Unit via Technology Center 2800 fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 4C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (15 November 1989).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nitin Parekh whose telephone number is (703) 305-3410. The examiner can be normally reached on Monday-Friday from 08:30 am-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas, can be reached on (703) 308-2772. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722 or 7724.

Nitin Parekh

04-09-02

Steven Loke
Primary Examiner

